1 Introduction: Preaching in the Age of Globalization

In this age of globalization, preaching is a highly sophisticated theological practice of religious communication. Its complexity is due mainly to ongoing global integration, interaction, and reaction among different cultures, sub-cultures, ethnic groups, ideologies, theologies, generations, religions, and social trends. Here, ‘global’ refers to the way in which one can easily and simultaneously encounter such complex interactive phenomenon in almost every ecclesial community around the world. This globalized context of ecclesia creates unique opportunities and challenges for the practice of Christian preaching, the ultimate aim of which is the proclamation of God’s Kingdom coming on Earth in its most generic sense. Such opportunities include (a) preaching as locus of intracultural and transcultural communication of the Gospel, (b) preaching as dialogical stimulant for reconciliation and possible resolution of social conflicts, (c) preaching as prophetic exposure to the multiple dehumanizing effects of globalization, (d) preaching as most effective venue for projecting voices from social margins, and (e) preaching as culmination of multireligious or transreligious conversation. On the other hand, preaching faces challenges such as (a) becoming an advocate for oppressive powers and privileged voices, (b) lacking the theological or hermeneutical foundations needed to exegete the complex multicultural context, (c) adopting the tendency to exclude non-Christian values and other belief systems, and (d) losing its eschatological vision at the dawn of utopian globalism.

Figures like James R. Nieman, Thomas G. Rogers, Eunjoo Kim, Justo L. González, Pablo A. Jiménez, and Kwok Pui Lan see the era of globalization as presenting more opportunities than challenges for preaching. They all contend that preaching can have more liberating power and influence when we enlist the best of globalization, when we caution against its pitfalls, and finally alter its cultural, political, and ideological trajectory from a healthy Christian point of view. Their thoughts can be summed up as five areas for further exploration: preaching as a transcultural enterprise, a postcolonial enterprise, a multi-religious enterprise, an eco-feminist enterprise, and a digital and glocal enterprise. Rather than being mutually exclusive, these five areas are closely interlocked but have different foci.

One’s perception of globalization cannot help but rise from one’s specific cultural or contextual experience of it. In my case, I experienced it as an Asian American. This chapter will demonstrate my Asian American interpretation of globalization, either implicitly or explicitly – especially, in Preaching as Multi-religious Enterprise.
2 Preaching as Transcontextual Enterprise

James R. Nieman and Thomas G. Rogers in *Preaching to Every Pew: Cross-Cultural Strategies* (Nieman and Rogers 2001) draw significant homiletic attention to the multicultural and interreligious situations of congregations today. Noting the inevitable nomadic nature of the world’s population (North America in particular), they identify four cultural frames that generate diversity within congregations: ethnicity, class, displacement, and different religious beliefs. The preacher therefore faces the urgent task of understanding the cultural diversity of each congregation that results from these four cultural frames and of developing preaching strategies that embrace, celebrate, and promote that diversity. Noteworthy is their interreligious concern on ways that may foster both a pastoral form of pluralism and a distinctive growth in Christian faith. They suggest that innovations in a collaborative and conversational homiletic will help the cross-cultural preacher carry out these emerging tasks.

Yet Eunjoo Mary Kim in *Preaching in an Age of Globalization* identifies a crucial downside to the cross-cultural method Nieman and Rogers endorse — although she acknowledges its merits — and moves the contextual homiletic conversation a step forward. Labeling their method as ‘intracontextual’, she notes that it focuses only on the contextual complexity of North American local congregations, ignoring their external relations to global contexts (Kim 2010) — a lacuna given local congregations’ deep entanglement in global affairs. Instead, she proposes a transcontextual homiletic and hermeneutic. Here transcontextual means a congregational situation deeply intertwined with both local and global issues.

Since Kim suggests that what is most at risk is our dehumanization, to preach on the restoration of genuine humanity must be a high priority. To that end, she suggests three interrelated conceptions of preaching practice: preaching as the formation of a shared identity, as a nurturing apperception, and as strategic planning (Kim 2010, 54–63). Of these, the homiletic application of “apperception” is most crucial. Apperception is “conscious perception with full awareness” (Morris 1975, 63), a “uniquely human capacity of knowing” (Lehmann 1995, 23), which enables one to perceive and pursue one’s true humanity. Preaching must nurture this unique human faculty of apperception in the mind of the listener experiencing dehumanization in the transcontextual environment, both within and beyond church walls.

Given the complicated existential and social reality of transcontextuality, Kim urges preachers to develop what she calls a “kaleidoscopic” practice of preaching that is “thoroughly contextual by transcending the local context in an effort to embrace the larger world as the context for preaching” (Kim 2010, xii). For such transcendence and embrace, the preacher must recognize dehumanization on both local and global levels simultaneously. Kim herself does not explore specific topics of dehumanization (see sections below), yet her perception of preaching as transcontextual enterprise is surely universally applicable today.
3 Preaching as Postcolonial Enterprise

Postcolonial criticism, as Emmanuel Y. Lartey explains, refers to “the study of how the colonized made use of and transcended [various] colonial strategies in order to articulate and assert their dignity, self-worth and identity, and to empower themselves” (Lartey 2015, ix). The result of that criticism should be “life-enhancing and constitutively opposed to every form of tyranny, domination, and abuse [...] [along with] non-coercive knowledge produced in the interests of human freedom” (Said 1991, 28). This practice of postcolonial criticism has been widely adopted by homiletics and preachers in their efforts to deconstruct dehumanizing colonial powers and influences within their own national, global, and migratory contexts. For them, the notion of postcolonial or liberative preaching is in their very essence.

_**Púlpito,** by Justo L. González and Pablo A. Jiménez, gives perhaps the best example of postcolonial preaching in the Hispanic American context. González and Jiménez note that the bicultural and bilingual immigrant situation has had a huge impact among Hispanics, and that this has led to their severe marginalization and oppression in North America. To address the people’s status of colonial repression, the Hispanic pulpit first approaches Scripture as “the liberating text” or “readings of resistance” with an eschatological hope (González and Jiménez 2005, 43). When the Hispanic preacher reads the Bible, “he or she finds a message written by and for the marginalized and the oppressed” (González and Jiménez 2005, 44). The preacher then seeks the points of contact between the social location of the listening community today and that of the text. Finally, the preacher speaks a message of change, resistance, liberation, and hope through the hermeneutical “correspondence” between today’s community and that of the text (González and Jiménez 2005, 44). González and Jiménez believe that other ethnic or racial groups under other forms of colonial oppression can easily adopt this postcolonial homiletic in their particular cultural situations.

_Kwok Pui Lan does exactly this, but in an innovative way. She defines postcolonial preaching as “a locally rooted and globally conscious performance that seeks to create a Third Space so that the faith community can imagine new ways of being in the world and encountering God’s salvific action for the oppressed and marginalized” (Kwok 2015, 2). If the methodology by González and Jiménez has a from-negative-to-positive ethos and dynamic – simply put, “we have bad news now, but will have good news eventually!” Kwok’s has a from-positive-to-positive hermeneutical orientation; that is, “we as marginalized have a great potential now, which will give birth to a new reality!” She sees the locus of oppression and marginalization as the seedbed for fresh imagination for the new world, that is, the “third space” (Bhabha 1994, 1).¹ People of

¹ Homi Bhabha is considered to have coined the term _third space_ based on his postcolonial notion of _hybridity_, which Kwok adopts in her writing. He notices that people oscillating between the colonizer’s hegemonic-cultural authority and the person’s initial cultural orientation come to formulate a hy-
undue privileges, biases, and oppressive powers have lost the power of imagination needed to build a new reality. This imagination is now found only in the hopeful calls from the outcast and oppressed for a New Heaven and a New Earth. It is they who have the potential to overturn the colonial status quo.

Recently, Sarah Travis introduced a Trinitarian decolonizing homiletic that is more doctrinal, ecclesial, and theo-centric compared to those proposed by Kwok, González, and Jiménez above. Decolonizing preaching, she contends, should generate a “perichoretic space”, in which the preacher and the listening community encounter the triune God of perfect harmony, mutual respect, and unconditional self-giving (Travis 2014, 60–63). That sacred encounter enables people of the ecclesial community to strive for the same triune harmony, respect, and self-giving in this world as their resistance and liberation against the colonizing reality.

In the era of globalization, all these contributors to postcolonial homiletics acknowledge that postcolonial considerations of preaching will have to go on, as colonialism in its new forms (e.g., (neo)capitalism, neo-Nazism, racism or white supremacy, ultranationalism, etc.) still continue to appear as major forces of distortive social and individual formation.

4 Preaching as Multi-Religious Enterprise

As briefly mentioned above, Nieman and Rogers proposed a pastoral way of considering multireligious preaching. Their proposal is for a dynamic interreligious dialogue embedded in the practice of preaching that leads to a respectful form of pluralism and continuing growth in Christian faith. I showcase how this respectful form of pluralism and continuing growth in Christian faith has been actualized in the Korean American immigrant context (Yang 2016). I have realized that for the Korean ethnic community in particular, preaching as a multi-religious enterprise has helped weaken hostility and unexamined biases among people of different religions within the same ethnic group. I excavate five socio-ecclesial codes and related styles that frame multireligious faith fundamentals of Korean American Protestants and the resulting preaching practice. They are:

brid identity that is new to the former two, though emerging and taking certain characteristics from both. This new hybrid identity appears as disruption and displacement of the existing colonial powers, which cannot fully grasp the new cultural thrust and creativity of the hybrid people and thus dismiss it by their typical universal cultural claims. Translated politically or sociologically, hybridity becomes a key source of protest, subversion and reconstruction of colonial-hegemonic society. Where the existing-exclusive colonial status quo is subverted, people of hybrid identity newly create the more inclusive third space that “initiates new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation.” As an additional note, homiletician Johan Cilliers from South Africa makes brilliant use of the concept of third space in his argument for an aesthetic and liberative liturgical space based on Edward W. Soja’s ideas, see Johan Cilliers (2016).
1. *The Wilderness Pilgrimage Code*: This code is strongly backed by Sang Hyun Lee who finds the Abraham story in the Hebrew Bible as the narrative upon which Asian American Christians have constructed their own version of the “pilgrimage-in-the-wilderness” story as the community’s ontological narrative ground. He writes (Lee 2001, 61–64), “The Abrahamic obedience to God’s call has been invoked in the Asian American church. The challenge is to see the Asian immigrants’ *de facto* uprootedness as an opportunity to embark on a sacred pilgrimage to some God-promised goal, and therefore to believe that life as strangers and exiles can be meaningful.”

- The Allegorical-Typological Narrative Style
- The Eschatological-Symbolic Narrative Style
- The Illustrative-Utilitarian Narrative Style

2. *The Diasporic Mission Code*: The evangelical mission’s work with both co-ethnic groups and other ethnic groups has been strong ever since the Korean American church’s conception in America (Warner 2001, 30; Tan 2008, 57–64; Park 2001, 57–64). It is no wonder then that the Mission Community code has been one of the most fundamental ingredients of the practice of Korean American preaching. According to various sociological studies, this evangelical trend is being rapidly intensified among most Asian American churches (Tan 2008, 143–61).

- The Internal Otherness Style
- The Ironic Reverse Style
- The Identification Partnership Style

3. *The Confucian Egalitarian Code*: Confucianism is an unavoidable socio-religious force in Asia which has taken certain bicultural mutations in the Asian American context and has fundamentally influenced the constructs of Korean American faith in deep theological relation with the other codes.⁰ Although there seems to be only one rigid form of Confucian practice in the Korean American church (under the patriarchal leadership of the male elder pastor), in reality there have been several recent variations in style, two of them being most widely accepted and practiced.

- The God the Father Style
- The Mother as Good Mentor Style

---

² In Asia, Confucianism is now practiced as a ‘religion’ on three levels. First, formal institutionalized Confucianism is performed as a “glorious” tradition by a variety of loosely connected Confucian institutions. Second, Confucianism is practiced by individual households in the form of patriarchal ancestor worship in keeping with the Confucian family model. Third, individual Confucian followers in broader society, even though they do not perceive themselves as formal Confucian practitioners, represent and practice the general Confucian culture or its value system and philosophy. In a practical sense, and in terms of socio-cultural norms, the third level is the most influential Confucian social factor that comes to construct the basic Asian/Asian American mindset today (Hongkyung 2007, 163–176).
4. **The Buddhist Shamanistic Code:** In today’s religiously pluralistic Asian and Asian American contexts, Buddhism and Shamanism, both of which have existed for thousands of years as key folk religions, often intermingle with each other and generate certain widely-accepted religious practices (Hongkyung 2007, 22–33). Even though most contemporary Asian people might not identify themselves as strictly Buddhist or Shamanist, their everyday practice of social relations, popular mindset, and religious thinking are still under significant influence from both traditional religions. Thus, it was inevitable that when Christianity first arrived in East Asia, it had to (and still has to) go through some notable enculturation or inter-religious process in the Asian context. Accordingly, certain religious aspects of Buddhism and Shamanism have been migrated or integrated into Korean American Christianity.
   - The Eco-Rhythmic Community Style
   - The Buddhist Shamanistic Supernatural Style

5. **The Pentecostal Liberation Code:** As Allan Anderson observes, it is no exaggeration to say that most contemporary Asian Protestant churches are evangelical Pentecostal or at least have been largely influenced by the Pentecostal movement (Anderson 2014, 123–34). Thus, it is only natural that when these Pentecostal Asian Christians come to America they set up similar ‘Spirit-led’ churches across denominations – regardless of ethnic groups. Their Pentecostal characteristics, of course, appear most vividly in their communal worship services. In these services, worshippers emphasize and seek out the strong presence of the Spirit through a variety of liturgical mediums, depending on their particular contexts and congregational needs, such as audible prayer, a Praise and Worship band, speaking in tongues, charismatic leadership or pastoral preaching. What is most intriguing in this code is that worship within the Pentecostal Liberation Code acts as a space wherein facets of all four aforementioned codes converge and are integrated into a single practice, especially in the practice of preaching. The people’s Pentecostal spirituality takes on a strong flavor of (spiritual) liberation, given their socially oppressive wilderness situation in America.

---

3. A good Korean example of this is found in Kim (2008, 142–146).
4. While the Chinese Pentecostal movement supported by the western Pentecostal missionaries has been active from 1907 in the main land and now has about a fifty-one million population through the underground church connection, not many Korean or Korean American churches were evangelistic or Pentecostal when Korean churches first began to form. These were aided by mostly non-Pentecostal foreign missionaries in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. However, rather suddenly throughout the late 1980s and all of the 1990s, the evangelistic Pentecostal trend was popularized and intensified throughout most Korean denominations when the Americanized revivalist Praise and Worship movement hit (Joo 2005, 484–491). Japanese Pentecostalism still remains relatively small, but is rapidly increasing in its influence and population (Shew 2005, 487–508).
The Pure Spirituality Style
The Prosperity Living Style
The Liberative Style

While all five codes demonstrate in one way or another the multireligious formation of Korean American faith and preaching practice, the Confucian Egalitarian code and the Buddhist Shamanistic code are the most explicit. These two codes are the end-products of the inculturation of missionary-delivered western Christianity into Confucian ideology-based, Buddhist-Shamanistic Korean society over the past century. Through the interaction with Confucianism, which upholds family values and superior education, the Korean Christian pulpit has become a place of familial community building and spiritual teaching. For that reason, the images of father and mother as respectful teachers and mentors in the community are of unmistakable importance in their faith life.

Furthermore, historical interaction with Buddhism, which emphasizes meditative prayer practice and ecological harmony, and Shamanism, which is both truly humanitarian and supernatural, have left an indelible imprint on the practice of Korean preaching. Meditative preaching is almost always expected at early morning services that typically begin at 5:30am. On Sunday mornings, messages that address basic human needs (food, health, wealth, childbearing, connection, security, etc.) are particularly welcome, especially when they invoke supernatural power to help meet these needs.

Korean Americans are Koreans living in North America. Thus, it is no wonder that their Christian faith and preaching is formulated through the active interactions of two disparate cultural and religious backgrounds. After all, Korea is the only nation on earth that celebrates the birthday of Buddha and that of Jesus as national holidays with absolutely no conflict about it in society. Thus, preaching as a multi-religious enterprise is never foreign to Korean preachers and their listeners, even if both parties do not recognize it on a conscious level. This is an extremely plausible form of religious pluralism that cultivates both unique growth within Christian faith as well as respect for other religions. I think that through creative variations, this model could be adopted in other ethnic or cultural groups in North America as well as around the world.

5 Preaching as Eco-Feminist Enterprise

The exploitation of the natural world and obstacles to women’s welfare have emerged as fatal issues of globalization and thus as prime concerns for preaching in the last couple of decades. Eco-feminism as the ideological foundation for the advocacy of the natural world and women “sees a connection between the exploitation and degradation of the natural world and the subordination and oppression of women. It [...] takes from the green movement a concern about the impact of
human activities on the non-human world and from feminism the view of humanity as gendered in ways that subordinate, exploit and oppress women” (Mellor 1997, 1). Eco-feminists especially recognize patriarchal dominance over both the environment and women as the connecting point between the two. Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva point out that “everywhere, women were the first to protest against environmental destruction” (Mies and Shiva 2004, 334).

A quarter of a century earlier, Christine M. Smith paved the way for preaching from a feminist perspective, though not yet eco-feminist. She criticized traditional male-dominant homiletic tendencies of autonomy, authority, individuality, and detachment while valuing female emphasis on authenticity, communality, intimacy, and interdependence in ecclesial life and preaching. These feminine qualities, incorporated into preaching practice, she believed, can “create a quality of humanness that is so persuasive and honest that it calls people into connection and solidarity” (Smith 1989, 48). Smith’s rather mild feminist approach to feminist preaching developed into a more progressive one in her Preaching as Weeping, Confession, and Resistance: Radical Responses to Radical Evil (Smith 1992). In particular, Chapter 3. “Breaking Silence Exposes Misogyny” is worth reading, as it proposes detailed homiletic strategies to resist and overcome destructive and evil social and domestic practices against women.

In the twenty-first century, Leah D. Schade further developed Smith’s feminist discourse to the eco-feminist dimension in her Creation-Crisis Preaching: Ecology, Theology, and the Pulpit. Schade, like earlier eco-feminists, acknowledged the historical-patriarchal connection between the destruction of nature and oppression of women in the current globalized world. Attacks on and degradation of vulnerable women easily transfer to the irreversible hurt on Mother Nature and vice versa. For instance, in many parts of the world, when nature suffers from corporate evil activities, women’s burdens are doubled or tripled (for example, dumping industry-related hazardous chemicals into rivers forces indigenous women who rely heavily on those rivers for drinking water, washing, and food supply to leave their native homes and workplaces). Given the urgent eco-feminist situation, Schade hopes that preaching practice can serve as a sacred medium to “help listeners find common ground for communicating about how we may proclaim God’s word of justice, hope, reconciliation, and healing for the Earth’s community, inclusive of humanity” (Schade 2015, 35). For this homiletic purpose, Schade proposes three generic eco-feminist approaches to environmental preaching: consciousness-raising, calling for specific action, and deep transformation coupled with sustainable change (Schade 2015, 47–50).

For the foreseeable future, at least in the global North, such eco-feminist concerns will remain one of the most critical issues that the Christian pulpit should address as we now face unprecedented environment disasters and many old and new forms of misogynist oppressions (for example child pornography, human trafficking, sexual abuse, commercialization of sex, neo-capitalist slave labor, the social glass
More than ever, the pulpit is expected to provide continuing resistance and ultimate hope in unique ways.

6 Preaching as Digital and Glocal Enterprise

Since the 2000s, the digital and internet revolution has transformed how the Christian church operates and how the Gospel message is communicated. This has brought both benefits and problems. Given the formidable digital revolution of human communication, Keith Anderson, in his *Digital Cathedral: Networked Ministry in a Wireless World*, proposes an ecclesial model of the “digital cathedral” (Anderson 2015). Rather than simply suggesting that churches of the digital age should go completely online, he calls on churches to open their eyes to and practice “an expansive and holistic understanding of church – one that extends ministry both into digital and local gathering spaces” (Anderson 2015, 20). In other words, he is calling for a comprehensive digital ecclesiology that may better serve this new age’s communicational demands in both digital and local spaces.

Following Anderson’s cue, Casey Sigmon proposes the innovative idea of “home- ecclesiology” (Sigmon 2017, 142) as a readily applicable possibility for preaching to the highly networked audience of today. Homilecclesiology is a compound word comprised of homiletic and ecclesiology. By this novel term, what she proposes is a digital homiletic of all believers that can preach “beyond the limits of the liturgical event, sanctuary space, and face-to-face encounter” within the digital space (Sigmon 2017, 142). This kind of digital preaching should be fundamentally cooperative, bilateral, and intimate while at the same time “radically horizontal, fluid, and spontaneous”, as all these qualities are innate characteristics of digital communication. In short, preaching should become a communal and participatory event in a democratic digital space. Thus, Sigmon encourages churches to use the three most influential and user-friendly digital platforms for this preaching purpose: Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. These platforms are not ethically neutral spaces, yet when used wisely and with caution, she acknowledges that they can prove themselves as effective digital homiletic channels for today’s people. One of the greatest benefits of this digital homilecclesiology is that the preacher’s message can instantly reach countless different cultural, racial, gender, and national groups on a global scale, through translation if necessary. Then, ideally, preaching can function as a catalyst for global harmony, racial reconciliation, cultural exchange, and even rigorous interreligious dialogue.

However, no matter how timely and persuasive Sigmon’s argument looks, one thing is undeniable; digital communication means weak ecclesiality. Cyber communities will likely never replace the intimate relationality of conventional offline communities. Yet excellent online preaching can still stir frequent and very positive digital interactions among participants. For this reason, emerging ecclesial communities are blending their cyber activities and those offline in a balanced way, preaching
being one of those activities. Certain communities from the outset intentionally form themselves as a ‘glocal’ mosaic of different cultural, racial, gender, and national groups, just as their online preaching reaches out to those groups, with no physical limits (DeYmaz 2013).

Mark DeYmaz contends that the multiculturalism of the church should not be recognized as a novel goal of the church today, as indeed it is the biblical mandate. Citing Acts 2 and many other parts of the Scripture, he realizes that multiculturalism was engraved into the life of the church from very early on (DeYmaz 2013, 3–39). We may now be returning to the original multicultural formation of the church, thanks to the digital revolution. For many racially and culturally divided – if not segregated – congregations today, homilecclesiology and its supplemental multicultural ecclesiality may be able to serve as a vital aid for their hopeful future.

7 Conclusion

The best preaching practice in the age of globalization is, at its core, to be collaborative, liberative, and dialogical, as most of the figures mentioned in this chapter would agree. Global preaching should also rely on a multireligious rhetoric that speaks the truth in love far beyond the church walls. Thankfully, with the digital revolution and internet connecting all parts of the earth, there is now virtually no place where a preacher’s word cannot be heard. The five streams of global homiletics also show that there are fatal dehumanizing challenges that may easily squash the proclamation of the good news of the Gospel. Therefore, there is no guarantee that the preacher’s word will be well-received (as has so often been the case in human history). What is then expected of the preacher is to be swift and wise, to seize the opportunities of the new era for the maximum homiletic use. This new era calls for deeper wisdom and proactive engagement of the preacher in every possible way, to present the living Word of Christ at both the local and global levels in the best possible ways.

5 The term glocal (or glocalization) is a combination of global and local, indicating a socio-cultural and economic phenomenon wherein distinction between local and global is blurred due to the vibrant interaction between the two. Local still remains local and so does global. Yet, their amalgamation is now inseparable. See Robertson 2002, 25–44.

6 DeYmaz believes that multi-ethnicity of the church should not be a goal of the church’s mission but a starting point and foundation of the church. One excellent example of this kind of multi-ethnic and multicultural ecclesial philosophy is actualized in Village Baptist Church in Oregon, USA. The Village Church has under its roof several churches or fellowships, as they call themselves, from different ethnic groups, including Chinese, Korean, East Indian, Hispanic, and Caucasian. Every Sunday, the main worship service is provided in three different languages: English, Korean, and Spanish. Although the primary vocal language for worship is English, pastors from ethnic groups share in the preaching. For more information about this church, visit http://www.vbconline.org/ (30.11.2021).
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